Vol. VII. No. 21
FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

OFFICIAL WEEKLY ORGAN OF
THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1919

Drawn for The Suffragist by Nina E. Allender

Democrat: *May I have the Honor?*
Republican: *May I have the Honor?*

National Woman's Party

(Incorporated, 1918)

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS, 14 JACKSON PLACE, LAFAYETTE SQUARE, WASHINGTON, D. C., Tel. Franklin 7120

BRANCH HEADQUARTERS

Delaware, 17 East 7th Street, Wilmington. *Tel. Wilmington* 5580

District of Columbia, 14 Jackson Place, Lafayette Square, Washington, D. C. *Tel. Franklin* 7120

Louisiana, 325 Carondelet St., New Orleans

Maryland, 817 N. Charles Street, Baltimore. *Tel. Mt. Vernon* 3279

Massachusetts, 9 Park Street, Boston. Tel. Haymarket 4048

New Jersey, 709 Union Building, Clinton Street, Newark *Tel. Market* 3117

New York, 13 East 41st Street, New York. *Tel. Murray Hill* 5444

Pennsylvania, 213 Penfield Building, Philadelphia. *Tel. Filbert* 5652

OBJECT: TO SECURE AN AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ENFRANCHISING WOMEN

MEMBERSHIP: Open to all women who, regarding woman suffrage as the foremost political issue of the day, support it irrespective of the interests of any national political party.

ENTRANCE FEE: Twenty-five cents. There are no dues.

National Executive Committee

Miss Alice Paul, *Chairman*
Miss Mabel Vernon, Del., *Secretary*
Miss Mary Gertrude Fendall, Md., *Treasurer*
Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, D. C.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn, Conn.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker, Md.
Mrs. Henry G. Leach, N. Y.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Pa.
Miss Doris Stevens, Neb.
Mrs. Richard Wainright, D. C.
Miss Maud Younger, Cal.

National Committee of State Chairmen

Chairman, Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles

Arkansas
Mrs. Edward M. Jarrett
Batesville

California
Mrs. Genevieve Allen
117 Tenth St.
San Francisco

Colorado
Mrs. Bertha W. Fowler
1225 Wood Ave., Colorado Springs

Connecticut
Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn
356 Laurel St.
Hartford, Conn.

Delaware
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles
17 East 7th Street, Wilmington

District of Columbia
Miss Sheldon Jackson
14 Jackson Place
Washington, D. C.

Florida
Miss Helen Hunt
417 West Church St.
Jacksonville
Mrs. A. Travers Ewell (Chairman Campaign Committee)
153 Powell Place, Jacksonville

Idaho
Mrs. Marcella Pride
Boise

Illinois
Mrs. Lola Maverick Lloyd
362 Hawthorne Lane
Winnetka

Indiana
Mrs. W. C. Bobbs (Acting)
1610 N. Delaware St.
Indianapolis

Iowa
Miss Florence Harsh
(Legislative Chairman)
Hubbell Bldg.
Des Moines

Kansas
Mrs. Lilla Day Monroe
909 Harris St., Topeka

Kentucky
Miss Cornelia A. Beach
428 South 1st St., Louisville

Louisiana
Mrs. E. J. Graham
7025 Freret St., New Orleans

Maine
Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse
108 Vaughan Street, Portland

Maryland
Mrs. Donald R. Hooker
817 North Charles St., Baltimore

Massachusetts
Mrs. Agnes Morey
9 Park Street, Boston

Michigan
Mrs. Nelson Whittemore
2967 West Grand Boulevard
Detroit

Minnesota
Mrs. A. R. Colvin, Davern Ave.
St. Paul

Mississippi
Mrs. N. D. Goodwin
Gulfport

Secretary, Miss Mary Ingham

Nebraska
Mrs. W. E. Hardy
(Member Advisory Council)
Calvert Place,
R. F. D., Lincoln

New Hampshire
Mrs. Winfield Shaw
2324 Elm St., Manchester

New Jersey
Mrs. J. A. H. Hopkins
709 Union Building, Clinton St.
Newark

New Mexico
Mrs. Arthur A. Kellam
707 South Arno St.
Albuquerque

New York
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont
13 East 41st St., New York City

Mrs. John Winters Brannan (acting)
137 E. 66th St.

North Carolina
Mrs. E. St. Clair Thompson
Spruce Pine
(present address Hotel Colonial
N. Y. City)

Ohio
Mrs. Valentine Winters
319 West 1st St., Dayton

Oklahoma
Miss Ida F. Hasley
Lee Huckins Hotel
Oklahoma City

Oregon
Mrs. W. J. Hawkins
571 Myrtle St.
Portland

Pennsylvania
Miss Mary Ingham
213 Penfield Bldg., Philadelphia

South Carolina
Mrs. W. P. Vaughan
P. O. Box 792
Greenville

South Dakota
Mrs. A. R. Fellows
Sioux Falls

Tennessee
Miss Sue White
Jackson

Texas
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe
909 West 18th Street
Austin

Utah
Mrs. Louise Garnett
125 P St., Salt Lake City

Virginia
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith
204 East Grace St., Richmond

Washington
Mrs. Frederick Forest
2417 Pacific Ave., Spokane

West Virginia
Mrs. U. A. Vincent
Shinnston

Wisconsin
Miss Ada James
Richland Center

National Advisory Council

Chairman, Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., N. Y.

Vice Chairmen
Miss Susan P. Frost, S. C.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. Alden Potter, Minn.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.

Secretary, Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.

Miss Ella Abeel, Ill.
Mrs. Frederick T. Ackerman, N. Y.
Mrs. Robert Adamson, N. Y.
Mrs. W. R. Alvord, Mich.
Mrs. Charles E. Amidon, N. Dak.
Mrs. W. D. Ascough, Mich.
Miss Mary E. Bakewell, Pa.
Mrs. M. R. Bankston, La.
Mrs. Bion H. Barnett, Fla.
Mrs. Cyrus Beard, Wyo.
Mrs. M. Toscan Bennett, Conn.
Mrs. Orlow Black, California
Mrs. William Blauvelt, N. Y.
Mrs. Howard P. Boyle, Ohio
Mrs. Alfred H. Bright, Minn.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. W. G. Brown, W Va.
Mrs. Henry Bruere, N. Y.
Mrs. Robert Bruere, D. C.
Miss Mary A. Burnham, Pa.
Mrs. Dora Phelps Buell, Col.
Mrs. Annie Wells Cannon, Utah
Mrs. John Carey, Ind.
Mrs. Joseph Carey, Wyo.
Mrs. Elinor Carlisle, Cal.
Mrs. Thomas L. Chadbourne, N. Y.
Mrs. Margaret Zane Cherdron, Utah
Mrs. Ross A. Collins, Miss.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Miss Anna Constable, N. Y.
Mrs. Vincent Cook, Ore.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. R. P. Crump, Miss.
Mrs. Lucius M. Cuthbert, Col.
Dr. Maria M. Dean, Mont.
Miss Lavinia Dock, Pa.
Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr, N. Y.
Mrs. Victor du Pont, Delaware
Miss Crystal Eastman, N. Y.
Mrs. John C. Edwards, Mass.
Mrs. Henry Ess, Mo.
Mrs. J. Bordon Estee, Vt.
Mrs. Sara Bard Field, Cal.
Mrs. Robert Patterson Finley, N. J.
Mrs. William Floyd, N. Y.
Mrs. Marie Moore Forrest, D. C.
Mrs. J. Andre Fouilhoux, Ore.
Mrs. L. Crozier French, Tenn.
Mrs. Emma Maddox Funck, Md.
Mrs. Mary Garbutt, Cal.
Mrs. Susan Lawrence Gehrman, Ill.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Adolphus E. Graupner, Cal.
Mrs. Jennie Law Hardy, Mich.
Mrs. W. E. Hardy, Neb.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. William Randolph Hearst, N. Y.
Mrs. George Hendrie, Mich.
Mrs. Elon Huntington Hooker, N. Y.
Mrs. Henry E. Hovey, N. H.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Mrs. Agnes Jenks, R. I.
Mrs. Adelaide Johnson, N. Y.
Miss Marie Ernst Kennedy, Pa.
Mrs. Charles Gilmore Kerley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Fola La Follette, N. Y.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. Samuel A. Lindsay, Tex.
Dr. Sarah H. Lockrey, Pa.
Miss Marian May, N. Y.
Mrs. Lillian M. McAdow, N. Y.
Mrs. John E. McCall, Tenn.
Miss Belle McGibeny, N. J.
Miss Bernice McCoy, Idaho
Mrs. Benton MacKaye, D. C.
Miss Hazel MacKaye, Mass.
Mrs. Ida Finney Mackrille, Cal.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Mrs. Marcus M. Marks, N. Y.
Miss Julia Marlowe, N. Y.
Miss Helen Marot, N. Y.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn.
Mrs. Cyrus Mead, Ohio
Miss Vida Milholland, N. Y.
Miss Katherine A. Morey, Mass.
Mrs. John T. Morrison, Idaho
Mrs. Henry Moskowitz, N. Y.
Mrs. William Spencer Murray, Md.
Mrs. Mary Nolan, Fla.
Mrs. Fremont Older, Cal.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Horton Pope, Colorado
Mrs. Annie G. Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. W. H. Ridenbaugh, Idaho
Mrs. James M. Rector, Ohio
Mrs. Isaac Reese, Tenn.
Miss Ella Riegel, Pa.
Mrs. Julius Rosenwald, Ill.
Mrs. A. S. Rossin, N. Y.
Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, D. C.
Mrs. Frederick Sanborn, Cal.
Mrs. Townsend Scott, Md.
Mrs. Samuel Shields, Tenn.
Mrs. Eugene Shippen, Mich.
Mrs. Frances Thurber Seal, N. Y.
Mrs. Mary Wright Sewall, Ind.
Mrs. Austin Sperry, Cal.
Mrs. Albert Steinfeld, Ariz.
Mrs. Julius Stone, Ohio
Miss Grace Strachan, N. Y.
Mrs. David D. Terry, Ark.
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelson, Ore.
Mrs. Robert Gibbes Thomas, S. C.
Mrs. W. I. Thomas, Ill.
Miss Clara L. Thompson, Mo.
Mrs. William B. Thompson, N. Y.
Mrs. Shelley Tolhurst, Cal.
Mrs. Samuel Untermeyer, N. Y.
Mrs. J. P. Vollmer, Idaho
Mrs. Hattie D. M. Wallis, Col.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Adeline Otero Warren, N. M.
Mrs. James Whittemore, Mich.
Dr. Marion Walker Williams, Ariz.
Miss Fannie Witherspoon, Miss.
Mrs. F. L. Woodward, Colo.
Mrs. Pope Yeatman, Pa.
Mrs. S. B. M. Young, Mont.
Mrs. Fanny Bloomfield Zeisler, Ill.

National Departments

Headquarters Maintenance Committee
Mrs. William Kent

Finance
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis

Lobby
Miss Maud Younger

Legislative
Miss Doris Stevens

State Legislative Chairmen
N. Y.—Mrs. Wilmer Kearns
(Greater New York)
Mrs. Wm. H. Blauvelt
(up state)
Pa. —Miss Marie Ernst Kennedy

Political
Mrs. Abby Scott Baker

Press
Mrs. Florence Brewer Boeckel

State Press Chairmen
Colorado—Mrs. Iris Calderhead Walker
Connecticut—Mrs. Annie G. Porritt
Georgia—Miss Eleanor Raoul
New Hampshire—Mrs. Lillian Ainsworth
New Mexico—Miss Bertha Becker
Maine—Mrs. Madaleine Louis Freeman
Pennsylvania—Miss Caroline Katzenstein
South Carolina—Miss Mabel Pollitzer
Texas—Miss Ruby Black
Virginia—Miss J. S. Jennings

National Organizers

Miss Lucy Branham
Miss Mary Dubrow
Miss Julia Emory
Miss Catherine M. Flanagan
Miss Betty Gram
Miss Elsie Hill
Miss Caroline Katzenstein
Mrs. Charles F. Moller
Miss Vivian Pierce
Miss Anita Pollitzer
Miss Margaret Whittemore

Woman Suffrage Committee Organized in Congress

AT the Republican caucus of the House held on Saturday, May 17, the following Republicans were chosen for membership on the Woman Suffrage Committee of the House: James R. Mann, of Illinois, Chairman; Edward C. Little, of Kansas; Richard N. Elliott, of Indiana; John I. Nolan, of California; Sherman E. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; Adolphus P. Nelson, of Wisconsin; John MacCrate ,of New York; and George W. Edmonds, of Pennsylvania. By this action the caucus accepted the recommendation of the Republican Committee on Committees for the House, which had been appointed shortly after Congress adjourned in March.

Immediately after Congress convened on Monday, May 19, the Republicans proceeded to organize the House in accordance with the plans made at the Republican caucus and the Republican members of the Suffrage Committee at once took office.

All of the Republican members of the Suffrage Committee are supporters of the national suffrage amendment. Two members, Representatives MacCrate and Nelson, are new members of the House. Only two members, Representatives Little and Elliott, had been on the Suffrage Committee in the last House.

On Wednesday morning, May 21, Mr. Kitchin, of North Carolina, the leader of the Democrats in their Committee on Committees, by virtue of his position as ranking Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, reported to the House that the Democratic members in the House had nominated the following members for the Woman Suffrage Committee: John E. Raker, of California; Frank Clark, of Florida; James H. Mays, of Utah; Christopher D. Sullivan, of New York; Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas. These nominations were accepted by the House.

Representative Raker, of California, the ranking Democrat on the Committee, was chairman of the Suffrage Committee in the sixty-fifth Congress from the time that the Committee was first created in the autumn of 1917. All of the Democratic members of the Committee are suffragists excepting Representative Clark. All were members of the Suffrage Committee in the last Congress.

The Woman Suffrage Committee has been in existence in the House since 1917. Prior to that time the suffrage amendments were referred to the Judiciary Committee.

THE organization of the Woman Suffrage Committee in the Senate was not completed until a week after Congress assembled. On Wednesday, May 14, the Republican caucus chose Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts, as the Republican leader of the Senate, and empowered him to appoint the Republican Committee on Committees. Mr. Lodge appointed Mr. Brandegee, of Connecticut as chairman of the Committee on Committees, and later appointed the other members of this committee which had in its hands the appointing of the Republican members of the Suffrage Committee, as well as of all other committees.

A meeting of the Republican caucus was held on Monday, May 26, before the convening of the Senate, at which the Committee on Committees made its recommendations for the Republican membership of the Senate committees. It recommended for the Woman Suffrage Committee the following:

Chairman, Mr. Watson, of Indiana; Mr. Cummins, of Iowa; Mr. Jones, of Washington; Mr. Nelson, of Minnesota; Mr. Hale, of Maine.

These recommendations were accepted by the Republican caucus, and at the session of the Senate on May 26, these senators were nominated members of the Woman Suffrage Committee. All of the Republican members of the committee are suffragists. Three of them, Senators Jones, Nelson, and Cummins, were on the Suffrage Committee in the last Senate, and all of them were members of the last Senate.

The Democratic members of the Suffrage Committee as chosen by the Democratic Steering Committee, and accepted by the Senate, are as follows:

Mr. Jones, of New Mexico.
Mr. Johnson, of South Dakota.
Mr. Owen, of Oklahoma.
Mr. Ransdell, of Louisiana.

All of the Democratic members of the Senate Suffrage Committee are suffragists, and all four were members of the Committee in the last Senate.

The Suffrage Committee has existed in the Senate since the early days of the agitation for suffrage when Susan B. Anthony was working at the Capitol.

Senator Hale of Maine Pledges Sixty-Sixth Vote

ON May 22, the day following the passage of the amendment by the House of Representatives, Senator Frederick Hale, of Maine, Republican, announced that he would support the amendment in the Senate. His announcement was made in a telegram to Colonel Fred N. Dow, of Portland, Maine. This brings the Republican support in the Senate up to 40 votes out their voting strength of 49, and makes a total of 66 votes pledged to the support of the amendment in the Senate, two more than the two-thirds vote required. Senator Hale voted against suffrage in the Senate in October, 1918, and in February, 1919. He was not a member of the Senate when the measure was brought before it in 1914, the only other time when it was voted upon in the Senate.

With two senators, Mr. Harrison, of Mississippi, and Mr. Dial, of South Carolina, still doubtful, the poll shows that only twenty-eight senators are openly opposed to granting suffrage to women.

SENATOR Hale's announcement read:

"The question of a federal amendment to the constitution relating to woman suffrage will shortly come up before the Senate. I took no part in the campaign prior to the state referendum on woman suffrage in 1917, but took the position that I would follow the wishes of the voters of Maine as expressed by this referendum when the question of suffrage should come before the Senate during the next Congress. The state having voted against suffrage, accordingly I voted at the last Congress against the proposed national amendment.

"At the last session of the Maine legislature a bill was passed granting presidential suffrage to the women of the state for the election to be held in 1920.

"The legislature of Maine has therefore declared the women of the state are qualified to vote in a presidential election. If they are qualified to vote in a presidential election they are certainly qualified to vote in any other election. Therefore, as I do not feel that I am longer bound by the position taken by me in 1917 prior to the state referendum and as my state by the vote of its legislature has granted presidential suffrage to women, I feel I am now justified in voting for the amendment when the matter comes before the Senate, and shall do so."

Commenting on Senator Hale's announcement, Alice Paul, chairman of the National Woman's Party, said:

"The announcement by Senator Hale, of Maine, that he will vote for the suffrage amendment following upon the similar an-

Continued on Page 9

THE NATIONAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following articles be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

THE AMENDMENT IN THE 66th CONGRESS

Introduced
In the Senate
May 20, 1919, by Senators Jones of New Mex., Johnson of Calif., Jones of Wash., and Poindexter of Wash.
In the House
May 19, 1919, by Representatives Mann of Ill., Mondell of Wyo., Taylor of Colo., Blanton of Tex., French of Idaho, and Raker of Calif.
Reported from Committee
In the House
Favorably May 20, 1919
Voted Upon
In the House
May 21, 1919, yeas 304, nays 89, passing by 42 over necessary two-thirds majority.

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Drafted
In its present form, by Susan B. Anthony in 1875.
First Introduced
January 10, 1878, by Hon. A. A. Sargent, in the Senate.
Reported from Committee
In the Senate
1878, Adverse majority.
1879, Favorable minority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority.
1890 Favorable majority.
1892, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Adverse majority.
1913, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.
1917, Favorable majority.
In the House
1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.
1916, Without recommendation.
1917, Without recommendation.
1918, Favorable majority.
1919, Favorable majority.
Voted Upon
In the Senate
January 25, 1887. Yeas 16, nays 34. Absent 25 (of whom 4 were announced as for and 2 against).
March 19, 1914. Yeas 35, nays 34, failing by 11 of the necessary two-thirds vote.
October 1, 1918, yeas 54, nays 30, failing by 2 of the two-thirds vote.
February 10, 1919, yeas 55, nays 29, failing by one of the necessary two- thirds vote.
In the House
January 12, 1915. Yeas 174, nays 204, failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.
Passed January 10, 1918, by one vote over necessary two-thirds majority.

Passed May 21, 1919. Yeas 304, nays 89, passing by 42 votes over necessary two-thirds majority.

The Suffragist

MAY 31, 1919 VOL. VII No. 21

Issued Weekly by National Woman's Party

14 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Editor, Sue S. White

Contributing Art Editors

Nina E. Allender
Cornelia Barns

Circulation Committee

California—Mrs. Alice Park
Colorado—Mrs. Charlotte Dinwiddie
Florida—Miss Ruby Leach
Illinois—Mrs. Alfred Linton
Indiana—Mrs. M. B. Spellman
Iowa—Miss Blanche Robbins
Louisiana—Mrs. Alice Cosu
Massachusetts—Mrs. Stephen Chase
Michigan—Mrs. James Whittemore
Minnesota—Miss Nettie Blasing
New Jersey—Mrs. Marguerite Washington
New Mexico—Mrs. Emily R. LaBelle
Ohio—Mrs. Mary D. Brite
Pennsylvania—Mrs. Edwin C. Grice
Wisconsin—Mrs. F. T. Andrea

Subscriptions: Domestic, $1.00; Foreign, $1.50. Single copies 5 cents. Make checks, drafts, and post-office orders payable to The Treasurer of the National Woman's Party

Columbian Printing Company, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Postoffice at Washington, D. C., under act of March 3,1879

The Vote in the House

ON January 10, 1918, the vote on the suffrage amendment in the House of Representatives, was 274 to 136, only one vote more than the required two-thirds. On May 21, 1919, it was 304 to 89, forty-two votes more than the required two-thirds.

Again the greatest support for the amendment is from the West. In the twenty-two states which lie west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Texas and Louisiana, only one vote was cast against the amendment. In that part of the North and Middle West which lies east of the Mississippi and comprises Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan and West Virginia, only five votes were cast against the amendment. Coming eastward, the opposition increases, in the Mid-Atlantic, New England and Southern states. As in 1918, the support has been wide-spread and the opposition concentrated. The largest opposing majorities today, aside from the South, are in the states of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts.

Of the 117 new members, who have been elected since the previous vote, 103 are favorable. Former members opposed who changed to the support of the amendment are 15. The New England gains are from former opponents who changed after success was assured by the support of new members. The most notable changes were in Texas, Ohio, and Massachusetts, the 1918 majorities opposed being respectively 12 to 6, 12 to 8, and 10 to 6. Of these same state delegations in this Congress, there were but 7 votes cast in opposition from Texas, 2 from Ohio, and 5 from Massachusetts.

Twenty-six states are now unanimous in their support. Thirteen states have large favorable majorities, two are tied, and seven unfavorable majorities. Of 21 new men from the South, 13 are suffragists, and six former members from Southern States who were opposed have now voted favorably. In 1918 there were five Southern States unanimously opposed, Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina. Today only the latter two, Mississippi and South Carolina, remain unanimously opposed, each of the other three giving one favorable vote. Two Southern states that were tied in 1918, Tennessee by a 5 to 5 vote and Florida by a 2 to 2 vote, now show a majority for suffrage by a vote from the Tennessee delegation of 7 to 3 and from Florida of 3 to 1. Kentucky, which was 7 to 4 in 1918, is today 9 to 1.

The Republicans have 71 new members, 65 of whom are favorable. Republican members formerly opposed who have changed to support of suffrage are 6. The Democrats have 45 new memebrs, 37 of whom are favorable, while 9 of the Democrats formerly opposed have changed. The Republicans now give for the amendment 84 per cent of their voting strength in the House, and the Democrats 54 per cent of their voting strength.

Taking the analysis from every aspect, it is seen that the gains have been so general as to constitute a veritable landslide and it is with confidence that we can now turn to the Senate for another glorious victory.

Introduction of the Suffrage Amendment in Sixty-sixth Congress

THE suffrage amendment was introduced by six members in the House and by four in the Senate.

On the first three days of the session, May 19, 20, and 21, 1919, Representative Mann, of Illinois, (Republican) Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee; Representative Mondell, of Wyoming, Republican floor leader; Representative Raker, of California, (Democrat) who had been nominated by the Democrats as minority leader on the Suffrage Committee; Representative Taylor, of Colorado, Democrat; Representative Blanton of Texas, Democrat; and Representative French, of Idaho, Republican, introduced bills embodying the text of the amendment.

The suffrage resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator Jones, of New Mexico, (Democrat) who was Chairman of the Senate Woman Suffrage Committee in the last Congress. It was also introduced in the Senate by Senator Jones, of Washington (Republican), Senator Johnson, of California (Republican), and Senator Poindexter, of Washington (Republican).

The text of the amendment in each case, excepting the resolution introduced by Senator Poindexter, was that known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment and reading, with slight verbal variations, as follows:

"ARTICLE—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The text of the two resolutions introduced by Senator Poindexter were as follows.

"That section 2 of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States be amended to read as follows:

'SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each state, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a state, or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the inhabitants of such state, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such citizens shall bear to the whole number of citizens twenty-one years of age in such state.'"

"That section 1 of the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States be made to read as follows:

'The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, sex, color, or previous condition of servitude.'"

THE amendments in both houses were immediately upon their introduction, referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee.

In the House there were no hearings before the Suffrage Committee. On Tuesday morning, May 20, the first meeting of the Committee was held. The meeting was attended by the Republican members of the Committee and by the Democratic Representatives who had been chosen by the Democrats for membership on the Committee, but whose names had not yet been presented to the House. It was decided by the Committee to report the suffrage amendment favorably, and on the same day the report was made to the House by Mr. Mann, the Chairman.

In the Senate, since the new suffrage committee had not been organized at the time the suffrage resolutions were introduced, they were sent to the Suffrage Committee existing in the last Senate.

WHEN the suffrage resolution which had passed the House came before the Senate on Friday, May 23, it also was referred to the Woman Suffrage Committee. An effort was made to obtain unanimous consent to have this resolution read twice and placed on the calendar without referring it to Committee. Senator Jones, of Washington, ranking Republican member of the Woman Suffrage Committee of the last Senate and Senator Johnson, of California, both spoke in behalf of placing the resolution on the calendar and dispensing with bringing it before the committee. Senator Underwood, of Alabama, Democrat, a vigorous opponent of the amendment, objected, saying:

"I am not willing to consent that the joint resolution shall be taken up in the Senate until it has been carefully and fully and deliberately considered by the appropriate committee. Therefore, of course, I object."

Vice-President Marshall then ruled that the resolution must go to Committee.

Following the sending of the suffrage amendment to the Woman Suffrage Committee, Senator Jones, of New Mexico, said:

"The joint resolution which has just come from the House is one which we are all anxious to see passed, and which I am satisfied will be passed as soon as a vote can be had upon it. I have hesitated, thus far in proceeding as a member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage and as its chairman at its last session of Congress in taking any action on the joint resolutions which have been heretofore introduced in the Senate upon that subject, and out of deference to my successor, whoever he may be, I should not be disposed to take action at this time were it not for the fact that there seems to be some apprehension that quite a time will elapse before any committees are organized. This joint resolution, it seems to me, should be acted upon without any great delay, and if the old committees are still in existence, and the members feel justified in acting, as far as I am concerned, I do not want to delay action on the joint resolution. However, I am willing as a matter of courtesy to defer action if that is thought best by the members on the other side of the Chamber."

The Vice-President then stated:

"The Chair has some very definite views on this question. Anticipating some controversy about it some sessions ago, the Chair made an examination. The Chair is satisfied that the Senate of the United States is a continuing body, and the Chair is satisfied that the old committees are in full force and effect and have power to proceed with the consideration of business, if they choose, until the new committees are organized by the Senate.

"In addition to that, the Chair has a recollection, which he hopes to verify in a moment, that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Martin) presented and there was adopted either on the last day or the day preceding the close of the last session of the former Congress a resolution that all the committees of the Senate should remain in full force and have power to act until the new committees were appointed. The Chair will verify that as soon as he can get the record. I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts said there was no Committee on Appropriation. He said there was not one which could act just now."

Mr. Martin, of Virginia, Democratic floor leader, said:

"Mr. President, I simply desire to say that the Chair is correct. I offered the resolution and was present and saw it adopted. I have a copy of it in my committee room. It was adopted unanimously."

The question was then discussed as follows:

Mr. Lodge—"Mr. President, the committees, of course, expire with the Congress which created them, but it has been the custom in the Senate for many years

Continued on Page 9

Suffrage Passed by the House

THREE hundred and four ayes and eighty-nine noes, was the overwhelming score on the Susan B. Anthony amendment in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, May 21, 1919. House Joint Resolution No. 1 was called up by Mr. Mann of Illinois, Chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, immediately upon the opening of the day's session, in accordance with the announcement made the previous day by Mr. Mondell, Republican floor leader. The roll call, which was taken about three o'clock in the afternoon, after two hours' debate, disclosed the fact that there were forty-two favorable votes more than the necessary two-thirds majority, and fourteen more than two-thirds of the entire membership, with a number of the absent members publicly pledged in favor.

One of the most interesting things about the two hours debate was the readiness with which the discussion resolved itself into political terms. There was very little said about woman's place being in the home or stranded high and dry upon a pedestal. The main points of interest seemed to be the records of the two great political parties in their support of the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

THE rules of the House provide that on calendar Wednesday general debate shall be confined to two hours. Mr. Mann stated that it had been his intention to ask that the debate be proceeded with through Wednesday and for a time on the next day before asking for a final vote but that since there was a committee appointed to attend the funeral of Congressman Van Dyke, and that the Nebraska delegation had an appointment to meet the Nebraska soldiers in New York on Thursday he would ask to have the debate end on Wednesday. He said, "I desire to have the House complete consideration of the resolution today, and I would like, especially in order to accommodate the proponents and opponents of the resolution, to give a longer time for debate than two hours. I ask unanimous consent that the rule, so far as it limits debate, may be abrogated and that at five o'clock the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, and any pending amendments, and that the time between now and then shall be equally divided, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Clark) and the other half by myself."

Objection was raised by Representative Moore, of Pennsylvania, (Republican) who asked whether hearings had been held on the resolution.

Mr. Mann replied that hearings had been held for more than fifty years; that hearings had been held on similar resolutions in the House of Representatives for a number of Congresses; but that there had been no hearings in this Congress, nor was there anything new to be said in a hearing.

Pro-Suffrage Democrats Want to Be Heard

In the division of the two hours time between Mr. Mann, who controlled the time during the debate for the Republicans and Mr. Clark ,of Florida, who controlled the time for the Democrats, the point was raised by Mr. Raker, of California, Democrat, that Mr. Clark was the one member of the Woman Suffrage Committee who was opposed to the resolution. He said that all Republican members favored it and all of the Democrats except Mr. Clark. Mr. Raker said: "Of course, the Democrats who favor it desire to be heard. I take it the gentleman from Illinois will yield me time so that time can be divided among the members of the Democratic side of the House who desire to speak for the resolution. It ought not to appear that members on this side are opposed to the resolution, for that is not the fact; but by fixing the time and giving one member who happens to oppose it on the Democratic side half of the time for debate in opposition, the impression might be conveyed that we are opposed to the resolution."

"The record will show who votes for it," replied Mr. Mann.

After considerable discussion, the debate was finally limited to two hours, according to the rules of the House.

The Rule of Reason

MR. Little, of Kansas, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, opened the debate with a strong speech in favor of the amendment. He said:

"Unless our sons and our billions have been sacrificed in vain, the world is about ready to substitute the rule of reason for the rule of force in the government of reasoning creatures. What better expression of that could there be than to say now that the mothers who risked their lives to bring into the world the four millions of soldiers we mustered shall have some word to say about the destinies of their sons? The British House of Commons voted, I think, 7 to 1, and recently, I believe, the French Chamber of Deputies voted 7 to 1 for woman suffrage. The time is opportune for making an era's close. Civilization has reached a stage, a period, a moment, when we can ring the liberty bell again and announce that this great step forward has been taken. . . . In the last analysis those who oppose woman suffrage simply ignore everything except brute force. They discard brains, scholarship, character, and simply seek to enforce the law of the herd that the biggest bull is the boss. Under their theories Napoleon Bonaparte was a greater man than Abraham Lincoln; John L. Sullivan a more useful citizen than Thomas Edison. I challenge all such claims as unworthy of the citizens of a Christian and cultured land. Carried to their logical conclusion, those theories have dominated and guided and wrecked and ruined the great Empire of Germany perhaps for centuries to come, and at the very moment when they had attained the rounded summit of a successful, brutal, despotic development of brute force. If during the last forty years the women had held absolute control of Germany that mighty state would now be rich, happy, contented, and yet there are still those who will tell you woman should not vote because she cannot fight. . . . As I have said to you, she takes the same risk that every soldier did. Which of you is there who has taken the same chance on any battle field that a mother has taken every time a child comes into the world? Who are you that you should say to the mothers of America that they can not vote as you do? . . . I appeal from the rule of force to the rule of reason. If common sense is more potent than the sword, if men have determined on the field of battle that that is their sober intention and their law, woman should now be accorded the same opportunity to take part in life that men have always had."

Congratulations to Republicans

REPRESENTATIVE Kitchin, of North Carolina, anti-suffrage Democrat, made a speech of congratulations, which may be considered as having some political bearing.

"I shall vote against this resolution," he said, "but I do not rise to make an argument against it, but rather for the purpose of an explanation and expression of some congratulations. It appeared in the Record yesterday, though not intentionally, that the Democratic organization of the House has been a little amiss in nominating the membership of the Woman Suffrage Committee. I want to say that that is simply apparent. This morning was the first opportunity which the Democrats had to present the names of the Democratic membership of the Woman Suffrage Committee, though the identical members that were this morning elected as minority members of that committee were notified and invited by Mr. Mann, the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, to meet in his committee room yesterday along with the majority members elected on Monday and participate in the consideration of this resolution. They did meet and consider this resolution, and they did vote, with the exception, I think, of one, for its favorable report. . . . "I wish now to express congratulations, sincere congratulations—to the Republicans on their quick response to the President's message on yesterday. The President, yesterday in his message, read from the desk, requested this Congress—and he knew that the Republicans were in the majority and had con-

House of Representatives

trol of the organization—to immediately pass the woman suffrage amendment. 'Immediate adoption' was his language, and in less time than 24 hours, the succeeding day, in come the Republicans, patriotically and loyally, presenting this amendment resolution in compliance with the President's request, and it will be carried."

Representative Mann here interrupted to say: "We reported it before the President's message was received."

Mr. Kitchin continued: "I want also to congratulate not only the leaders of the Republican Party, but the entire membership on the Republican side, on the ease and celerity with which, within 18 months, they have been able to jump on the band wagon. Let it be known that for 14 years, from 1897 to 1911, the Republican Party had control of every branch of this Government. It had control of the White House, it had control of the House of Representatives, it had control of the Senate. The Susan B. Anthony amendment had been before the American public for a half century. And yet during every one of those 14 years, session after session, its advocates came and appealed to the Republican Party in this House and the Senate to have this amendment considered by Congress, but a deaf ear was turned to them. They were absolutely ignored and were told to go back home and attend to their own business. The Republicans were in control of every branch of this Government for 14 years, I say, and when the advocates of this amendment found that they could not get the Republicans to submit this amendment to the consideration of the House or Senate, they then asked them to create a woman suffrage committee so that they could have hearings and present their cause. Again they were refused, again they were sent back home empty handed and without hope. . . . It was reserved for a Democratic Rules Committee and for a Democratic House to give the suffragists of this country a Woman Suffrage Committee before which they could go and put their case. They did go before this Woman Suffrage Committee, composed of a majority of Democrats, who gladly heard them day after day and week after week and month after month plead their cause. Be it known that it was a Democratic Woman Suffrage Committee that for the first time favorably reported this very resolution to the House and gave the advocates of woman suffrage a chance to have their cause considered and voted on in the House.

"And, gentlemen, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee in this Congress, for promptly reporting out of that committee the same resolution which the Democratic chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee in the last Congress reported out . . . and which the Democratic House passed last Congress, and which a Democratic President approved and now inisists on 'immediate adoption.'"

United States Lags Behind Other Nations

"THIS is one of the great fundamental questions confronting the American Nation today," said Representative Raker, of California, (Democrat) in taking up the debate in support of the amendment. "We have settled many other questions ahead of the civilized world, but we have been behind when it comes to treating half of our population and giving them the same right the other has with respect to participation in the Government. We are behind the other nations of the world in that respect. . . . This country has stood for the right of the individual to express his opinion, for the doctrine that he is responsible only to himself and to his God, but up to this date, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, we have said that one-half only of our population should express their views, give their sentiments, and have a voice in our Government. . . . Practically every civilized country in the world has extended the right of suffrage to women. Let us take first the little country that was devastated some four years ago by the rude Huns. They recognized that had women been able to participate in the affairs of the world before the war began, humanity would have been different, the conditions of the world would have been different, and we would have saved the lives of many hundreds of thousands of our best people, not only in this country, but abroad, as well as billions of dollars.

"While in Europe some months ago, we had the pleasure of riding with the chief deputy of the Belgian Congress from Paris to Brussels, and the next day that congress met and extended the right of suffrage to women. Let us go right on down the line. England with all her colonies, New Zealand, Canada, Australia, has extended the right of suffrage to women. This is so also of Sweden and Denmark. Even the country that the world has been fighting has extended a limited suffrage to women, and should we be the last of the civilized countries of the world to extend this right—we who boast that we stand for humanity, who boast that we stand for giving men the opportunity to express their voice in our government, that we might have a government of the people, not by heredity, but that the people might express their will and desire as to what their government should be? Is it right that we should be the last? . . .

"Within the next hour and a half the vote will have been taken and America will have taken her place with the civilized nations of the world in extending this God-given right, this thing that makes America worth while, this thing that men have died for, even within the last year, to the women of the country in order that they may exercise their individual right; that they may participate in the affairs of their country; that they may say that the laws under which they are living shall be such as human beings should live under—to the advantage of this country and of the children that are to come, so that we might have a stronger, a more virile, and a better race. . . . So far as politics are concerned, there should be no attempt to take advantage by either the Democratic or the Republican Party. . . . There may be a few Democrats and a few Republicans who in the past have voted against this who will again vote against it today, but they are going to be so scarce that you will hardly be able to count them. Notwithstanding that fact, the great body of the Representatives, Democrats and Republicains, will vote for this resolution, because neither party has a sufficient number of votes to pass it as a political measure."

Last Argument Met

REPRESENTATIVE McCrate, of New York, Republican, made his "maiden speech" in favor of the amendment. He said, in part: "Everywhere you went during the past two years you saw women in uniform. Whether you were at home or abroad, you realized that American womanhood had met the last argument that men have given for denying them the suffrage privilege, namely, that no one who is not a potential soldier is entitled to the franchise. I submit to your fairness and judgment that the women of America have been as potential soldiers during the past war as have been the men of America. If men who continued in agricultural pursuits to win the war, if men who continued in shipyards to win the war, if men who continued in other branches of activities to win the war are entitled to the franchise, the women who maintained equal industrial and agricultural burdens and high moral burdens to win the war are entitled to the franchise."

He was followed by Mr. Focht, of Pennsylvania, Republican, who opposed the amendment, basing his remarks largely upon what he assumed to be the will of his district, which he said "comprises eight counties,, typical of the Christianity, civilization, and the chivalry of America."

States' Rights Not Violated

MR. Black, of Texas, Democrat, in opposing the amendment, referred to "the right of a State to peaceably secede" as being forever settled in the negative—which may be considered more or less irrelevant to a discussion of woman suffrage since not even the most ardent suffragist from the fartherest point south has been so "militant" as to threaten secession! Mr. Black admitted that there can no longer be any sound contention

that any amendment which is adopted in the constitutional manner violates any of the rights of the other states. "The minority states must," he said, "of course, yield to the will of the majority." "But," he cautioned, "Congress should be careful in submitting amendments"—just as though it had not already taken forty years to deliberate.

"Do Justice"

ANOTHER Texas Democrat, Mr. Blanton, said, supporting the amendment: "I yield to no Democrat in loyalty to and love for my party. Yet, if, in order to pass this resolution today, it were necessary to give the credit to the Republican chairman of this committee, I would say pass it and give credit to him. If, in order to pass this resolution today, it were necessary to give the credit to the Republican Party, I would say pass it, do justice, give them the credit of it if such credit has to go to any particular party. . . . The proponents of this measure have a right to expect that the opposition, in opening the discussion of this question, would send to us the best argument they have against woman suffrage. But when they open this discussion by sending to the floor that distinguished, astute, eloquent orator from North Carolina (Mr. Kitchin) we had the right to expect that the last word in opposition to woman suffrage would be forthcoming, but the distinguished gentleman was unable to say one word against the passage of this resolution. He said, in effect—and it was all he could say—that he would blindly shut his eyes and vote against the resolution. He did, however, call attention to the fact that this suffrage resolution was introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress by a Democrat, that a suffrage committee was organized by a Democratic Congress, that it was reported by a suffrage committee with a Democratic majority, that it was handled on the floor of this House by a Democratic Majority ,and that it passed this House by a Democratic Majority. He said that it was called for as a piece of legislation by a Democratic President of this Nation. He called attention to that, and further to the fact that the President from France has asked this Congress to pass this resolution at this time. But, as a good Democrat as I am, I want to say to my colleagues that if the message read yesterday from the President of the United States had asked us to vote against woman suffrage it would have reached a point when I could no longer do that which a Democratic President asked of this Congress to do.

"I ask my good friends in what particular will this amendment restrict the regulation by states of suffrage? Why, the state of Texas, regardless of this resolution, will still by its legislation say what qualifications a person must possess in order to vote. They will say whether or not there should be a property right restriction placed upon it; they will say whether or not a person must have an educational qualification; they will say whether or not a person must pay a poll tax, whether they must register here or there; and in what particular. They will say this or that concerning every single regulation or control which will not interfere, except that by the Constitution they will not say that one-half of the citizens of the Union may vote and the other half, equally intelligent, equally qualified, shall not have equal rights that we men have possessed for time eternal. I say the time has come when justice must be done, though the heavens fall."

Women Good Law Makers

FACTS about women holding office in his state were given by Representative Vaile, of Colorado, Democrat, speaking in support of the amendment. He said: "I would willingly submit them to a comparison with an equal number of men legislators selected from the legislature of any Commonwealth in this country. They are just exactly the same kind of women as your own mothers and sisters. They were elected not because they were women but strictly upon their merits. They have left their names written on our statute books in measures for the benefit of the community, for the welfare of women and children, for the reclamation of unfortunates, the development of agriculture and industry, and the improvement of labor."

Progress by Gradations

FORMER Speaker Champ Clark, of Missouri, Democrat, and a supporter of the amendment, referred to a prophecy he made 29 years ago to the effect that the justice of the American people would give the right of suffrage to women. "When I came here," he said, "the voice of the suffragist was like that of John the Baptist, crying in the wilderness. It was more a joke than anything else, but time and the expressed sentiment of the American people have converted a majority of the House and perhaps a majority of the Senate to this doctrine. In the last Congress, by a curious accident, they got just exactly enough votes to pass this amendment through the House. I did not vote; I rarely ever did. I do not think it was ever intended the Speaker should vote very much, but one gentleman was going to change his vote to the negative and I sent word if he did I would vote and that would tie it, so I came that near voting.

The great state of Missouri at its last session of its legislature went as far as it possibly could go under the Constitution in favor of woman suffrage. They gave the right to women to vote for presidential electors and municipal officers and several other states have done the same. I believe in state rights as much as any gentleman on the floor of this House, but in voting for this suffrage amendment I am representing the voice of the people of Missouri. . . . From across the sea comes the voice of the leader of the Democratic Party and the leader of the American people, who was made that by two elections in this country—and it ought to be a matter of pride to every American citizen that Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, is universally acclaimed the foremost man of all this world. He has arrived at his opinion by gradations like a good many of the rest of us have. It is part of the progress of the human race going on all over the world, and if we want to keep in time with it we ought to pass this amendment. We can not afford very well, with our boasted civilization and our boast about our great intelligence, all of which I thoroughly indorse, to be behind every other civilized nation on earth in this matter."

Not a Partisan Question

"TWO years ago," said Representative Mann, "when a similar resolution was pending in this body, I took my life in my hands and came over here to vote, and for a week thereafter I did not know whether it would kill me or not. But today, strong and healthy, I appear in the advocacy of a great cause, with the time ripe, with the people ready with the beneficiaries eager, intelligent, and willing to perform their share in the functioning of good government.

"The distinguished speaker who has just preceded me referred, as had a Democrat formerly, to the message of the President. I had hoped that this discussion might proceed without any partisan bias. It is true that the President and Democratic leaders have frequently talked in favor of woman suffrage, but a majority of them have never voted for it. They have been long on promises, like they are on everything else, but very short on fulfillment. I heard the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina speak for seven minutes in favor of the amendment which he proposes to vote against.

"Now, this is not a partisan question on either side of the House. If it were, it would not have any chance. Let both sides, Republicans and Democrats, feel their responsibility to civilization, to enlightenment, to progress, to the movement ahead. You can no more stop the wave of progress than you can roll back the sea with a broom, which was tried once. Women will receive the suffrage; they will take their share in the management of the Government, and, in my judgment, good citizens everywhere will thank God shortly that we have the conservatism and good sense of women, the home makers, and remaining mostly in the homes, standing against the wave of unreasonable wildness which seems now to be dominating the world in many quarters."

The Opportuneness of the Time

REPRESENTATIVE Longworth, of Ohio, Republican, who voted against the amendment in the last Congress, spoke in favor of it. He said, in part: "If I am about to execute a volte face, at least it will not be comparable to that executed by a most distinguished American now residing abroad, who sent us a cable on the subject yesterday. It is true that upon the occasion when this resolution was last before the House I voted against it, but my vote was predicated upon a doubt as to the opportuneness of the time rather than upon the essential justice of the question. . . .

"Heretofore I have felt it my duty to follow the vote last cast by the citizens of my constituency. I believe, however, that since then the situation has changed."

A Constructive Step

THE debate was closed by Mr. Mondell, of Wyoming, Republican floor leader, who, to use his own words, "brought the balm of consolation to the agonized soul of the gentleman from Florida"—Mr. Clark, who was the chief opposing speaker. Mr. Mondell said he had been voting, lo these many years, and had never voted except where women voted. "I think it is a splendid omen that this session of Congress, in which we hope to write upon the statute books a progressive, constructive legislative program, begin with the prompt adoption of this great measure of franchise reform. . . . Before this season closes, in my opinion, this resolution will be upon the statute books of the nation. The resolution is in keeping with the spirit of the times; it is in keeping with the onward march of mankind toward better things. We are proposing to invite the better half of mankind into participation in the settlement of the multiplied and multiplying questions of government, and we shall have better laws, better administration, and a better world when that is accomplished."

OTHER speeches were made in support of the amendment by Representatives Nelson of Wisconsin, Republican, and Taylor of Colorado, Democrat. Speeches in opposition to the amendment were made by Representatives Hardy of Texas, Democrat; Small of North Carolina, Democrat; and Clark of Florida, Democrat. These speeches are not yet obtainable from the Congressional Record, as the members who made them wished to revise them and have them appear later.

Others who desired to speak, were unable to obtain time during the debate and asked unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Congressional Record. This was refused. The supporters of the amendment who endeavored to have their remarks placed in the Record, but were not able to do so, were Mr. Randall of California, Prohibitionist; Mr. Welty of Ohio, Democrat; Mr. Ferris of Oklahoma, Democrat; Mr. Barkley of Kentucky, Democrat; Mr. Langley of Kentucky, Republican; Mr. LaGuardia of New York Republican; Mr. Oliver of Alabama, Democrat; Mr. Ayres of Kansas, Democrat; and Mr. Rubey of Missouri, Democrat. All of these voted for the amendment. The following opponents of the amendment were also unable to obtain time to speak during the debate and were also refused consent to have their remarks extended in the Record: Mr. Gard of Ohio, Democrat; Mr. Lankford of Georgia, Democrat; and Mr. Small of North Carolina, Democrat.

"MR. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution," said Mr. Mann, when the time for debate had come to an end—and all the suffragists got out their pencils to count the vote.

First, however, there were two amendments that had been previously introduced. Both amendments to the suffrage resolution lost by an overwhelming vote without the roll being called. One, introduced by Mr. Clark, of Florida, provided that the amendment should be ratified within seven years; the other, introduced by Mr. Saunders, of Virginia, Democrat, provided that the amendment should be submitted to popular vote in three-fourths of the several states.

Finally, a few minutes before three o'clock, the clerk began to call the roll, and before four o'clock the record of the second victory in the House of Representatives was written.

This was the third time that the suffrage amendment had been voted upon in the House of Representatives. The first vote was taken January 12, 1915, when the amendment failed to pass by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote. The second time was January 10, 1918, when it passed by one vote over the necessary two-thirds.

Introduction of Amendment

continued from page 5

to continue them by special resolution. I want to see the exact wording of the resolution, which, it seems to me, it is difficult to find."

The Vice-President—"This is the resolution:

'Resolved, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.'"

Mr. Lodge—"Ah, that is just as I thought,—'until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.' Their successors have not been duly elected."

MR. Jones, of Washington, later in the day announced:

"Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of the House joint resolution No. 1 that was referred to that committee today, and I ask that the motion lie over for one day under the rules."

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Walsh, of Massachusetts) stated, "That action will be taken."

Saturday morning, May 24, a meeting was held of the members of the Suffrage Committee of the last Senate in the office of Senator Jones, of New Mexico, Chairman. It was attended by Senator Nelson, of Minnesota, Republican; Senator Owen, of Oklahoma, Democrat; and Senator Ransdell, of Louisiana, Democrat. It was decided at this committee meeting to support the proposal announced by Senator Jones, of Washington, on Friday, May 23, when he stated that he would move the following Monday, May 26, that the Senate discharge the Suffrage Committee from consideration of the suffrage amendment, in order that it might be brought to an immediate vote in the Senate.

Senator Hale's Pledge

continued from page 3

nouncement from the new Republican senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Keyes indicates that the Republicans in the Senate will follow the splendid lead of the Republicans in the House and speedily pass the suffrage measure.

"The pledge of Senator Hale means the Republicans have now given over four-fifths of their strength in the Senate to the support of suffrage. By so definitely lining their party up in support of the measure in both houses of Congress, the Republicans are giving their party the honor of making a most splendid contribution to the fight for the political freedom of women."

AN active campaign to secure the vote of Senator Hale has been in progress in Maine since the vote in the House in 1918. Mass meetings have been held ,and resolutions and petitions have been sent him from all over his state. Miss Betty Gram and Miss Julia Emory, national organizers of the Woman's Party, were sent from the National Headquarters to assist Mrs. Robert Treat Whitehouse, the state chairman of Maine, in this campaign. Among the larger meetings of the campaign was a theater mass meeting held in Portland, at which Dudley Field Malone and Miss Mabel Vernon, Secretary of the National Woman's Party, were the principal speakers.

When the legislature of Maine convened at the beginning of 1919, a petition, signed by a majority of the members of the legislature requesting Senator Hale to vote favorably on suffrage in the U. S. Senate, was obtained under the direction of Mrs. Whitehouse and presented by the Woman's Party to Senator Hale at Washington.

How The House Voted

Star indicates those who signified intention beforehand to vote favorably, thus assuring before final vote was taken enough votes to bring the amendment to a roll call. Many recorded as "not voting" were unable to reach Washington in time to cast their votes for the amendment, which came up sooner than expected.

Alabama

Yea

*Oliver (D)

Nay

McDuffie (D)
Dent (D)
Steagall (D)
Blackmon (D)
Heflin (D)
Almon (D)
Huddleston (D) not voting
Bankhead (D)

Arizona

Yea

*Hayden (D)

Arkansas

Yea

*Caraway (D) not voting
*Oldfield (D)
*Tillman (D)
*Wingo (D)
*Jacoway (D)
*Taylor (D)
*Goodwin (D)

California

Yea

*Lea (D)
*Raker (D)
*Curry (R)
*Kettner (D)
*Nolan (R)
*Elston (R)
*Barbour (R)
*Hersman (D)
*Randall (P)
*Osborne (R)
*Kahn (R) not voting

Colorado

Yea

*Vaile (R)
*Timberlake (R)
*Hardy (R)
*Taylor (D)

Connecticut

Yea

Lonergan (D)
*Freeman (R)
*Merritt (R)
*Glynn (R) not voting

Nay

Tilson (R)

Delaware

Yea

*Layton (R)

Florida

Yea

*Drane (D)
*Smithwick (D)
*Sears (D)

Nay

Clark (D)

Georgia

Yea

*Upshaw (D)

Nay

Overstreet (D)
Park (D)
Crisp (D)
Wright (D)
Wise (D)
Brand (D)
Bell (D)
Vinson (D)
Lankford (D)
Larsen (D) Not voting
Lee (D) Not voting

Idaho

Yea

*French (R)
*Smith (R) Not voting

Illinois

Yea

*Madden (R)
*Mann (R)
*Wilson (R)
*Rainey, J. W. (D)
*Sabath (D)
*McAndrews (D)
*Juul (R)
*Gallagher (D)
*Britten (R)
*Chindbloom (R)
*Copley (R)
*Fuller (R)
*McKenzie (R)
*Graham (R)
*King (R)
*Ireland (R)
*Smith (R)
*Cannon (R)
*McKinley (R)
*Rainey, H. T. (D)
*Wheeler (R)
*Rodenberg (R)
*Brooks (R)
*Williams (R)
*Dennison (R)
*Yates (R)
*Mason (R)

Indiana

Yea

*Luhring (R)
*Bland (R)
*Dunbar (R)
*Benham (R)
*Sanders (R)
*Elliott (R)
*Moores (R)
*Vestal (R)
*Purnell (R)
*Wood (R)
*Kraus (R)
*Fairfield (R)
*Hickey (R)

Iowa

Nay

Hull (R)

Yea

*Kennedy (R)
*Sweet (R)
*Haugen (R)
*Good (R)
*Ramseyer (R)
*Dowell (R)
*Towner (R)
*Green (R)
*Dickinson (R)
*Boies (R)

Kansas

Yea

*Anthony (R)
*Little (R)
*Campbell (R)
*Hoch (R)
*Strong (R)
*White (R)
*Tincher (R)
*Ayres (D)

Kentucky

Yea

*Barkley (D)
Kincheloe (D)
*Thomas (D)
*Johnson (D)
*Ogden (R)
*Cantrill (D)
*Fields (D)
*Langley (R)
*Robsion (R)

Nay

Rouse (D)

Louisiana

Nay

Dupre (D) (not voting)
Martin (D)
Watkins (D)
Wilson (D)
Sanders (D)
Lazero (D)

Yea

Aswell (D)

Maine

Yea

*Goodall (R)
*White (R)
*Peters (R)
*Hersey (R)

Maryland

Yea

*Andrews (R)
*Linthicum (D)
*Zihlman (R)

Nay

Coady (D)
Benson (D)
Mudd (R)

Massachusetts

Yea

*Treadway (R)
*Rogers (R)
*Phelan (D)
*Fuller (R)
*Fitzgerald (D)
Winslow (R)
Lufkin (R)
Dallinger (R)

Not voting

Gillett (R)
*Gallivan (D)
Olney (D)

Nay

Paige (D)
Tinkham (R)
Luce (R)
Walsh (R)
Green (R)

Michigan

Nay

Doremus (D)

Yea

*Michener (R)
*Smith (R)
*Hamilton (R)
*Mapes (R)
*Kelley (R)
*Cramton (R)
*Fordney (R)
*McLaughlin (R)
*Currie (R)
*Scott (R)
*James (R) (not voting)
*Nichols (R)

Minnesota

Yea

*Anderson (R)
*Ellsworth (R)
*Davis (R)
*Newton (R)
*Knutson (R)
*Volstead (R)
*Carrs (I)
*Steenerson (R)
*Schall (R)

Mississippi

Nay

Candler (D)
Stephens (D)
Sisson (D)
Venable (D)
Johnson (D)
Collier (D)

Not voting

Humphreys (D)
Quinn (D)

Missouri

Yea

*Romjue (D)
*Rucker (D)
*Alexander (D)
*Booher (D)
*Bland (D)
*Dickinson (D)
*Major (D)
*Nelson (D)
*Clark (D)
Newton (R)
*Igoe (D)
*Dyer (R)
*Rhodes (R)
*Hays (R)
*Rubey (D)

Not voting

*McPherson (R)

Montana

Yea

*Evans (D)
*Riddick (R)

Nebrsaska

Yea

*Reavis (R)
*Jefferies (R)
*Evans (R)
*McLaughlin (R)
*Andrews (R)
*Kinkaid (R)

Nevada

Yea

*Evans (D)

New Hampshire

Yea

*Burroughs (R)
*Wason (R)

New Jersey

Nay

Browning (R)

Yea

*Bacharach (R)
*Hutchinson (R)
*Ackerman (R)
McGlennon (D)
Minahan (D)
*Lehlback (R)
*Eagan (D)

Not voting

*Scully (D) (paired yea)
Ramsey (R)
Radcliffe (R)
*Hamill (D)

New Mexico

Yea

*Hernandez (R)

New York

Yea

*Hicks (R)
*McCrate (R)
*Cullen (D)
*Johnston (D)
*Rowe (R)
*Maher (D)
*Cleary (D)
*O'Connell (D)
*Haskell (R)
*Goldfogle (D)
*LaGuardia (R)
*Smith (D)
*Pell (D)
*Carew (D)
*Rowan (D)
*Siegel (R)
*Donovan (D)
*Griffin (D)
*McKiniry (D)
*Ganly (D)
*Husted (R)
*Platt (R)
*Ward (R)
*Sanford (R)
*Parker (R)
*Crowther (R)
*Mott (R)
*Snyder (R)
*Hill (R)
*Magee (R)
*Houghton (R)
*Dempsey (R)
*MacGregor (R)
*Mead (D)
*Reed (R)
*Sullivan (D) (paired yea)
*Snell (R) (paired yea)

Nay

Riordan (D)
Dunn (R)
Sanders (R)

Not voting

*Caldwell (D)
*Dooling (D)
Gould (R)

North Carolina

Yea

Godwin (D)
*Weaver (D)

Nay

Small (D)
Kitchin (D)
Brinson (D)
Pou (D)
Stedman (D)
Robinson (D)
Doughton (D)
Webb (D)

North Dakota

Yea

*Baer (R)
*Young (R)
*Sinclair (R)

Ohio

Yea

Longworth (R)
*Welty (D)
*Thompson (R)
Kearns (R)
*Fess (R)
*Cole (R)
*Sherwood (D)
*Foster (R)
*Ricketts (R)
*Begg (R)
*Davey (R)
*Moore (R)
*McCulloch (R)
*Ashbrook (D)
Murphy (R)
*Cooper (R)
*Mooney (D)
*Babka (D)
*Emerson (R)

Nay

Stephens (R)
Gard (D

Not voting

*Brumbaugh (D)

Oklahoma

Yea

*Howard (D)
*Hastings (D)
*Carter (D)
*McKeown (D)
*Ferris (D)
*McClintic (D)
*Morgan (R)

Not voting

*Thompson (D)

Oregon

Yea

*Hawley (R)
*Sinnot (R)
*McArthur (R)

Pennsylvania

Yea

*Vare (R)
*Costello (R)
*Darrow (R)
*Butler (R)
*Griest (R)
McLane (D)
*Casey (D)
Reber (R)
*McFadden (R)
*Kiess (R)
*Rose (R)
*Jones (R)
*Wilson (R)
*Kendall (R)
*Temple (R)
*Shreve (R)
*Strong (R)
*Hulings, (R)
*Porter (R)
*Campbell (D)
*Walters (R)

Nay

Moore (R)
Watson (R)
Dewalt (R)
Steele (R)
Lesher (D)
Focht (R)
Brooks (R)
Garland (R)

Not voting

*Edmonds (R)
Kreider (R)
*Kelly (I)
Morin (D)
Crago (R)
Burke (R)
Graham (R) (paired yea)

Rhode Island

Yea

*Burdick (R)
*Stiness (R)
*Kennedy (R)

South Carolina

Nay

Whaley (D)
Byrnes (D)
Dominick (D)
Nicholls (D)
Stevenson (D)
Ragsdale (D)
Lever (D)

South Dakota

Yea

*Christopherson (R)
*Johnson (R)
*Gandy (D)

Tennessee

Yea

*Sells (R)
*Taylor (R)
*Davis (D)
*Byrns (D)
*Sims (D)
*Fisher (D)
Padgett (D)

Nay

Moon (D)
Hull (D)
Garrett (D)

Texas

Yea

*Box (D)
Young (D)
*Sumners (D)
*Briggs (D)
*Lanham (D)
*Parrish (D)
*Bee (D)
*Hudspeth (D)
*Blanton (D)
*Jones (D)

Nay

Black (D)
Rayburn (D)
Hardy (D)
Eagle (D)
Mansfield (D)
Buchanan (D)
Garner (D)

Not voting

*Connally (D)

Utah

Yea

*Welling (D)
*Mays (D)

Vermont

Not voting

*Dale (R)
Greene (R) (paired nay)

Virginia

Yea

*Slemp (R)

Nay

Bland (D)
Holland (D)
Montague (D)
Watson (D)
Saunders (D)
Wood (D)
Harrison (D)
Flood (D)

Washington

Yea

*Miller (R)
*Hadley (R)
*Johnson (R)
*Summers (R)
*Webster (R)

West Virginia

Yea

*Neely (D)
*Bowers (R)
*Reed (R)
*Woodyard (R)
*Goodykoontz (R)
Echols (R)

Wisconsin

Yea

*Randall (R)
*Monahan (R)
*Kleczka (R)
*Esch (R)
*Browne (R)
*Classon (R)
*Frear (R)
*Nelson (R)

Nay

Voigt (R)
Lampert (R)

Wyoming

Yea

*Mondell (R)

Comments of the Press

The First Resolution

IT ought to be a good omen for the cause of woman suffrage that the first resolution to be offered after the formal organization of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-sixth Congress was that embodying the suffrage amendment. The movement for woman suffrage has already attained such momentum that nothing can permanently stay its progress towards final triumph. Justice and logic are both on its side. More than half the states of the Union are already enrolled under its banner, the enfranchised women of the nation are no longer a factor that the great national parties can afford to ignore, and the only remaining obstacles in the way are those created by reactionary prejudice.

There is no shadow of doubt now that the House is again overwhelmingly in favor of the passage of the amendment, and a recent poll of the Senate indicates that when the question shall again come to a vote the necessary two-thirds vote will be mustered in the affirmative. Then must come the ratification by the states, but in view of the big initial vote in favor of the amendment by the twenty-seven states where the women already have the full or presidential suffrage, there cannot be much doubt that ratification will come without much further delay.

It is not particularly creditable that the United States, which boasts of its democracy, should be a laggard in removing from its escutcheon so inconsistent a blot as the disfranchisement of half of its citizens. The cause of votes for women received a tremendous stimulus during the great war, when the women of the world bore so nobly their full part in the sacrifices and the labor. But the issue stands on a higher platform than merely one of gratitude for service rendered in the world crisis. What the women gave and did to save the world, however, opened the eyes of the blind to the absurd injustice and inconsistency of their position. All the great democracies of the world, excepting our own, have rectified a wrong which with us is only now in process of redressing. There is a hope, however, that before the end of 1920, at the latest, the United States of America will take a place after Holland and Sweden in the long roll of enlightened nations which no longer deny to their women a voice in their own government.—*Philadelphia Public Ledger, May 10, 1919.*

Suffrage Wins

YESTERDAY'S vote in the House whereby the woman suffrage amendment was adopted may be accepted as an indication of a sufficient change of sentiment for enfranchisement to carry the resolution through the Senate as well and to lay it before the state legislatures. Already changes have been noted in the upper house, and it is believed that two-thirds will vote for the resolution when it is brought up for final consideration.

When the House last voted on the suffrage amendment it carried by an exact two-thirds, a victory less pronounced than the supporters expected, but nevertheless sufficient. Yesterday 304 voted for the amendment, with 89 against, or more than three to one, a margin of 42 votes more than the necessary two-thirds. Nothing can more clearly denote the steady trend of opinion in this country for the admission of women to full political rights.

The House having made this resolution its first order of business at the special session, there is no reason why the Senate should not quickly follow suit, and, with a comparatively clear calendar of business ready for action, put the amendment likewise upon its passage promptly. The House acted without hearings, for the subject was perfectly well understood. The Senate, which has had hearings innumerable on this question, can with equal propriety bring the resolution to a vote without further preliminaries than a formal reference to committee and the presentation of its report.—*Washington Evening Star, May 22, 1919.*

Senator Harris of Georgia

HON. W. J. Harris, the new United States Senator from Georgia, announces that he will support an equal suffrage bill at the coming session of Congress.

The women of the South are getting closer and closer to the ballot all the time. There seems to be little doubt of the action of Congress at the extra session, which is to convene this month. The legislatures of the several states will be called upon to ratify an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which will eventually give to the women of the republic the right to vote. We are sorry the national Congress did not take this step when both the House and Senate were Democratic and we are glad to know now that Georgia's junior senator is prepared to vote for the proposed amendment. The Albany Herald, whose term of service has been sufficiently long to have permitted it to reach the age of discretion and whose judgment in most things is good, has recently declared that woman suffrage is coming. The paper based its utterances and conclusions upon the action of the Atlanta Democratic Executive Committee, which has opened the Atlanta Democratic primaries to women. Editor McIntosh concludes:

"That the right of suffrage is to be extended to women in Georgia, and in every other state in the Union, for that matter, is not doubted by thinking men who take a fair view of public affairs and are progressive enough to adjust themselves without prejudice to modern conditions; and what the Democratic Executive Committee of the city of Atlanta is now doing the legislature of Georgia will be doing before the end of many more sessions. Only a few old mossbacks are holding back the procession now, and these will be either retired or wear themselves out in due time.

"More and more is woman being forced out into the material affairs of the world, many of them doing men's work and sharing the responsibilities of business activities in all the avenues of industrial life; and it is travesty on justice to deny to a woman who carries a man's burden and pays taxes for the support of government the right to a vote in the election of those who are to administer that government, for no other reason than that she is a woman.

"Woman suffrage is coming. It may at first be limited in some degree, but the right of the woman who works and earns and provides and accumulates and pays taxes to have a voice in the affairs of government can not be much longer withheld by men who pretend to be fair and just."

It is not at all impossible, as was pointed out by an equal suffrage visitor yesterday, that to Georgia may fall the honor of being the first state to ratify an amendment to the Federal Constitution bestowing upon women the ballot.—*Savanah (Ga.) Press, May 14, 1919.*

Eastern Reactionaries

THOUGH women can now vote in New York, Senator Wadsworth, of that state, has never been converted to the suffrage cause and continues to oppose it vigorously at every opportunity. This course of his has its political bearings, for the senator's term will expire in 1921 and he is expected to be a candidate for re-election next year. The Republican women are strongly opposed to his reactionary views and threaten to slaughter him at the polls. Senator Penrose may have to face the same antagonism in this state, if through a federal amendment to the Constitution the women gain the suffrage. Both he and Senator Knox have consistently fought the demands of the women. These cross-currents in politics may have an influence on results which cannot now be foreseen.—*Philadelphia Record, May 14, 1919.*

A Niche in the Hall of Fame

MISS Alice Paul, chairman of the National Woman's Party, has figured that the suffrage amendment will lack one vote again when the new Senate convenes. Who will be the hero to switch and earn a secure niche in the suffrage hall of fame? Somebody will undoubtedly for it is hardly to be supposed that the amendment will fail to get through the next Senate. The dirft of the country, as shown in increasing extension of suffrage by the states, is too evident.—*Waterbury, Conn. Republican, April 29, 1919.*

New Fashions
IN
SUITS, COATS, WRAPS
GOWNS, DRESSES
BLOUSES, MILLINERY

Paris
New York
Washington

Gidding

Cincinnati
Philadelphia

Superb Furs
IN
SCARFS, MUFFS, ETC.
BELTED STOLES
CAPES, COATS

1510 H St. N. W. *Opp. Shoreham Hotel*

Members Securing Suffragist Subscriptions from May 15, to May 27, 1919

Miss Mary E. Dubrow, D. C.	2	Miss Sue White, Tenn.	1
Mrs. Genevieve Allen, Calif	1	Mrs. Phoebe C. Munnecke, Mich.	1
Mrs. Roger Cristy, Mass.	3	Miss Margaret Whittemore, Mich.	3
Miss Naomi Barrett, Del.	1	Miss Vivian Pierce, Calif.	4
Mrs. Clara Snell Wolfe, Texas	1	Mrs. Benigna G. Kalb, Texas	4
Mrs. Elizabeth A. Young, Tenn.	1	Miss Betty Gram, Mass.	2
Mrs. Pauline Adams, Va.	6	Mrs. A. H. Bright, Minn.	2
Miss Louisa Sturtevant, R. I.	1	Mrs. H. G. Richardson, Minn.	1
Miss Julia Emory, Md.	1	Mr. Mann Fletcher, N. Y.	1
Miss Caroline Katzenstein, Pa.	4	D. C. Branch, thru Miss Dubrow	2
Miss Nettie A. Blasing, Minn.	3	Pennsylvania Branch	38
Mrs. Lola M. Lloyd, Ill.	1	Ohio Branch	5
Miss Mary Gertrude Fendall, Md.	1	Illinois Branch	3
Miss Jennie Bronenberg, Pa.	1	Maine Branch	4
		Renewals	76
		Anonymous	2
		Total	176

Cornelison
515 H Street Northwest **Millinery** Washington, D. C.

"We Grow 'Cause We Know"

OUR composing Rooms are replete with the most fascinating and up-to-date Type Faces—all selected for the purpose of satisfying the demand of those whose tastes tend toward the better class of Printing. MAIN 4250
Columbian Printing Co., Inc.
815 14th N. W.

Telephone Maine 861
Brentano's
Booksellers, Engravers and Stationers
F and Twelfth Sts. Washington, D. C.

L. STONE CO.
MODES—INEXPENSIVELY STYLISH
THIRTEEN SIX WALNUT
PHILADELPHIA

JOHN C. PAIGE & CO.
Insurance
65 Kilby St., Boston. 115 Broadway, N. Y.

West End Trust Company

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

CAPITAL and SURPLUS
$4,000,000

Receives Deposits

Acts as Executor, Administrator
Guardian, Trustee, Agent

Sells Foreign Exchange, Travelers' Letters of Credit, Express Checks

Maintains an Up-to-date Safe Deposit Department and a Storage Department for trunks and packages

Manages Real Estate, Collects Rents etc.

Lends Money on Approved Collateral Security

H. Kann Sons Co.
"THE BUSY CORNER" PENNA. AVE. AT 8TH. ST.

Practical Petticoats
OF SATEEN and HEATHERBLOOM

—That will save the wear and tear of everyday use on your finer petticoats of silk or satin. They are all well made, and of good materials, and will launder well.

Sateen Petticoats, in regulation and extra sizes; the extra sizes are in flowered sateen, made with deep flounce, finished with a pleated ruffle. The regular sizes are in black, with deep pleated flounce which has a wide vandyke border in a figured effect. Choice---------- **$1.69**

—**Fine Quality Sateen Petticoats,** with novelty pleated flounce, finished with narrow pleated ruffle; these are in gray, green, blue and wistaria grounds, with overdesign in black figure and colored coin spot at---------- **$3.00**

—**Heatherbloom Petticoats,** made with deep flounce, fancy tucked and finished with two small ruffles, in plain colors, also a deep flounce, tucked and finished with small pleated ruffle, in green, navy, Belgian blue, rose and black.
—At the same price we have a Heatherbloom petticoat in a figured or Dresden pattern made with a deep flounce finished with small ruffles. **$2.25**

—**Extra Size Petticoats** of Heatherbloom at---------- **$2.50**

—**Extra Size Petticoats** of sateen and "Liberty Loom," at

$2.00 and $3.50

Kann's—Second Floor.